

## **MINUTES OF THE MEETING**

**28 October 1999**

### Projects Reviewed

Central Library  
John C. Cannon Retirement Facility  
Roxhill Park  
Lincoln Reservoir  
Royal Brougham Pedestrian Bridge

Convened: 9:00am

Adjourned: 4:00pm

### Commissioners Present

Rick Sundberg  
Moe Batra  
Ralph Cipriani  
Gail Dubrow  
Robert Foley  
Jeff Girvin  
Nora Jaso  
Jon Layzer  
Peter Miller  
Cary Moon

### Staff Present

John Rahaim  
Layne Cubell  
Kelly Rodriguez Walker  
Rebecca Walls

---

102899.1      Project: **Central Library**  
                  Phase: Scope Briefing  
          Presenters: Jim Brown, Loschky Marquardt Nesholm  
                          Alex Harris, Seattle Public Library  
                          Deborah Jacobs, City Librarian  
                          Joshua Ramus, Office of Metropolitan Architecture  
                          Dan Wood, Office of Metropolitan Architecture  
                          Bob Zimmer, Loschky Marquardt Nesholm  
          Attendees: See Attached  
                  Time: 2.0 hr. (SDC Ref. # DC00116)

The design of the new Seattle Central Library is in the pre-schematic design phase. Construction of the new 355,000 square foot facility is expected to begin in 2001 and be completed in mid-2003. The Central Library will be relocated to a temporary facility for the two year construction period. The new building is expected to accommodate the library collection through 2025. The project team intends to involve the public and library staff extensively in the design process, beginning with the first public meeting in December. The Central Library is the service hub for new books, services and technology for the entire Seattle Libraries system. A significant aspect of the new program will be to provide some public meeting space. There will also be expanded children and adult programs, technology training, and customer parking. The Library will be a prominent community and cultural anchor within the city that will provide a forum for engaging citizens in civic dialogue. It will be an important activity center in the downtown area and will provide a link to others in the community. These include: City Hall and the new Municipal Center to the south, the Convention Center to the northeast; Benaroya Hall and the Art Museum; the New Aquarium; the sports stadiums to the south, and the Experience Music Project at the Seattle Center. Important resources and functions of the library will be visible from the outside. Further, providing a sustainable building is an important goal. The public art budget is \$900,000 and the project team hopes to have an art manager on board by mid-schematic design.

The project architects, Office of Metropolitan Architecture (OMA) of Rotterdam, and Loschky Marquardt & Nesholm Architects (LMN) of Seattle, have formed a joint venture to work closely on the project. The last three months have been dedicated to researching the library of the future. A six-month schematic design period will be facilitated in Rotterdam, ending in April 2000. This will be followed by a public review period, six-months of design development, and then a nine-month construction document period.

The team began their project analysis with the interior program and is currently focusing on how libraries work and related urban design issues. As a point of departure, members of the design and project team visited libraries in Los Angeles, San Francisco, Phoenix and Denver, and held three days of meetings in Seattle with experts in the field of library and general technology.

The team believes that the classic image of the library of antiquity is a place of high morals and expresses the power of the book. In the last twenty years, the private sector has appropriated the public realm. As such, the library will have to compete with a high level of commercialism. Further, due to the proliferation and quality of the on-line and physical bookstores, some people with economic means have moved away from libraries. An important goal of the project team is to bring people back to the library by "stealing back" the aura that was stolen from the library by the bookstores.

The team is looking for ways to extend an urban design component inside the building. They feel that the traditional American library held a space for books and space for public life and that over time, the space for books became greater, while the space for the public became smaller. Another goal for the new

library is to place books within a hierarchy of other information resources, as the needs and functions of the library have increased with the addition of new types of media. The team believes that due to the quality and proliferation of computer technology, that this is an interesting and complex time to design a library. They are trying to come to terms with the current and future status of the book. Further, they feel that public spaces within the library may become more important over time and accordingly, the team wants to guarantee the place of the book *and* public space.

The complex program demands a flexible building design and the team has identified five operation & containment “platforms” that organize the requirements. The first platform is the *headquarters*, where staff will be able to work creatively. The second is the *book* platform, which will include the entire main collection. The *electronics and assembly* platform will provide technology and meeting rooms. The *retail store* platform will be located at the entrances on Fourth and Fifth Avenues, and will provide a place where people will first arrive at the library. The fifth platform is *parking and operations*. The in between or interstitial spaces will offer flexible public reading rooms, an information center, and a *living room* off of Fifth Avenue with a café. And, as the variety of media resources grows, the number of required public amenities will grow. As such, it is important to the team to make the interstitial spaces of the library “staff centric” as opposed to “information centric.”

Although many people questioned the choice of the new library site because of its slope and size, the project architect, Rem Koolhaas, was inspired by it and feels that it will positively contribute to the design. The team is looking to extend the hillclimb and is looking at the site’s relationship with the plazas that exist on three sides. The team is also looking for ways that the building will be able to relate to the surrounding context. They believe there are opportunities to make strong connections between Fourth and Fifth Avenues and are looking forward to seeing the design strategies for the new City Hall and Aquarium, as they will be under design and construction concurrent with the library. One potential problematic area for the new Central Library is the loading dock. The design team is considering the concept of a “one Address” facility that will include several entrances and the possibility of off-site loading.

### **Discussion:**

- Batra:** Seattle strives for a high level of diversity and I feel that the design of the library should celebrate this. The image you presented of the commercial center does not reflect this intention.
- Woods:** We were trying to say that this is the arena in which the library must exist and compete.
- Dubrow:** Despite our well intentioned ideals of creating spaces with civic character, public access and programmatic requirements such as loading docks tend to drive the design and conflict with the intent.
- Zimmer:** Many buildings in Seattle are presented with the challenge of being sited on a slope.
- Dubrow:** I encourage you to explore the range of opportunities.
- Sundberg:** There is a lot of discussion about how to define the urban design connections to projects such as City Hall. Identifying the options of this rare opportunity is a big task. Perhaps there is a cultural commonality between the buildings. It may be useful to touch upon the diversity of the community. These structures will strike deep roots in our society and will define government and intellect. As the design moves forward, I would like to hear how you will approach this. It would be worthwhile to have a discussion with the key players on the City Hall project.
- Dubrow:** I have a better understanding of how you are intellectually and creatively verifying the program, but I don’t have a sense for your method for analyzing the critical urban design issues.

- Foley:** It could be a discussion of the programmatic goals. You spoke about the entrances, but where will they actually be? How will the building respond to the surrounding context? What are the key influences?
- Ramus:** We mentioned our desire to respond to the surrounding plazas, existing and new buildings, and the ability of the public to use the services or circulation elements such as the hillclimb. As we begin to develop a building proposal, all of these components will come into play.
- Woods:** Today, we wanted to present our thoughts on the interior spaces. Our initial reaction to the urban fabric around the building is that it is gray and staid. Also, because the city grid is so strong in the area, we may want to respond in a more edgy and exciting way. Light is also a very important component.
- Dubrow:** Do you want to hug the sidewalk, or plaza?
- Zimmer:** Both, but we also have zoning and street frontage requirements to adhere to.
- Dubrow:** I would like to hear more about your response to these issues at the next presentation because there are a number of ways you can deal with them.
- Jacobs:** The architects and staff have been working on general research and internal operations to date, so this discussion may be premature today.
- Dubrow:** As the program begins to meet the public realm, we are concerned that it also addresses the surrounding context.
- Zimmer:** We have a lot of work to do between now and December when we will be able to have this dialog on a deeper level. Hearing your concerns today is an extension of our research period.
- Jacobs:** When Alex Harris and I first came before the Design Commission, we talked about the urban context and the dreariness of the site. We would now like to hear from the Design Commission on these issues.
- Moon:** The diagrams you've shown are extremely inventive, but I would like to see more *experiential* diagrams that illustrate how the public will interact with the library.
- Jaso:** Seattle is experiencing a time of richness and development and I encourage you to analyze the city for us, and with us, in terms of viewing the library as the last real public place that isn't trying to sell you something.
- Layzer:** I appreciate your analysis of the program and see the logic of some of the adjacencies. I hope that what you "steal back," enriches the area. I don't understand the siting of the children's area between the store and operations, and the living room between the store and public assembly. In an effort to ease any safety concerns that parents may have, perhaps the children's area should be located closer to the living room.
- Jacobs:** The library has not yet officially responded to the location of the program components. This was just one option.
- Layzer:** I'm not suggesting integration with the living room but maybe a closer relationship. If the spaces are completely separated, then you force a choice.
- Cipriani:** The library has a variety of access needs. Since many of the users of the library drive from the suburbs, and because the city has its share of mobility and access impaired, I feel that the parking allowance for 200 vehicles is too restrictive to accommodate all users. There needs to be more design consideration for a variety of transportation modes and vehicles.
- Jacobs:** Diversity of parking, drop-off and arrival is also important to us. We're also planning to address these issues at our upcoming meeting with the public.

- Ramus:** Part of our research included a demographic study. While we are designing the Central Library, we realize that the patrons will come from the larger region and will have a variety of needs.
- Dubrow:** I've only heard one controversial statement regarding the shift in perspective of what public space is or should be. The Carnegie era libraries expressed a clear idea that public space was non-commercialized. You opened your discussion with a strong statement of principle that for civic space to compete with the market in the next two decades, it needs to integrate architectural, spatial, and other devices that the marketplace uses.
- Jacobs:** I think what we're talking about are issues of open hours, lighting and display and that the principle you were hearing is a desire to "steal back" what was taken by retail.
- Dubrow:** I agree that you need to compete, but it sounded to me like you were taking cues from retail spaces in order to add character and vitality.
- Ramus:** It was an observation. Our second diagram defined our new form of flexibility. Our strategy is to be able to confidently design exciting, definitive and characteristic spaces that appeal to the public.
- Dubrow:** In the future, I would like to hear what the character and vitality generating elements are that you are drawing from the retail sector to incorporate into civic space. And, where you draw the line and protect it from becoming a place of the market.
- Ramus:** At this point, we haven't come to an agreement of what those elements are, but we have identified some that we think may be valuable to include.
- Jacobs:** A concept for a stronger Seattle presence is what we're talking about.
- Stadler:** I would welcome the relationship between commercial and public as an intellectual position, and an articulate exploration of where they come into conflict. When we speak of "stealing back" patrons, I think it's important to look at the metaphors of commerce we have accepted.
- Jacobs:** Rem Koolhaas has asked many people, including the board members, "Do you currently use the downtown library and if so, why? If not, why? What would make you change?" I would ask you the same question. It's not up to OMA or me. We need to hear what will bring *you* back into the library.
- Miller:** The current library is poorly packaged. The product is essentially the book, or a version of the book. When we visited the library, I discovered that it holds a wonderful architecture collection that few people know exists because it's hidden away. If you were to complete the new library today, you'd have a difficult time generating excitement based on the existing collection. The library needs to generate excitement based on its product.
- Jacobs:** I agree. Because the library has so many social functions it has lost sight of its book collection.
- Binns:** I am thinking of one of the users being the city itself; an administrative arm with City Hall four blocks away. A great way to open up the library would be to see officials walking back and forth, using the library for business. Has this been explored?
- Jacobs:** Yes. This week I had briefing on the Municipal Center and when Rick Sundberg asked what civic commonality is, I wrote down 'transparency of democracy.' We need to have more wiring between the city offices.
- Binns:** I work at the Dexter Horton Building and I am always walking back and forth to the Municipal Center. It forces me to get out of my office and I wonder if maybe we're too wired.
- Layzer:** You're looking at how to not let loading and parking dominate the site. Alternatively, you should look at how you insure that the pedestrian and commuter access is primary and

how the building can become a wayfinding device. These and other issues of orientation should happen early on in the design process.

**Gale:** We are challenging the Civic Center to become an international example of sustainable design and it would be great if you could also start thinking about the library in this way.

**Harris:** The building may be a marker in the skyline and will have a definitive presence on the sidewalk. We're learning from the context but are also looking to give something back to the city.

**Jaso:** When Rem Koolhaas made the initial presentation proposal, his comments on how art will be integrated into the project were more thoughtful than I had heard in a long time. As such, I'm very interested in how you will be collaborating with the Arts Commission and what the process, principles and priorities are that you will use to bring an artist in.

**Goldstein:** OMA and LMN are keeping an open mind and we don't want to limit our direction at this stage. There are a number of ways that this can go and we want to keep the process open ended and flexible.

**Jaso:** I would just like to see it integrated into all aspects of the project.

**Dubrow:** I hope you will have a broad sense of what forms the art will take. I also hope you will take a long-term view that will allow the art budget to work over time rather than just for the opening; art that unfolds over a period of years.

**Jacobs:** The foundation has a fund that could be used for an on-going program. Also, we have not discussed the possibility of keeping any of the existing art funding in reserve. In terms of current art, some will be used and some of it may go to branch libraries, neighborhood organizations, or the general city archive.

**Taylor:** One thing I like about the library is that it's not gentrifying the community. I think this is a critical component of the public space.

**Jacobs:** We acknowledge the diversity of our staff and patrons and want to recognize this in all aspects of the design. We also want to make sure that all users are safe and that no one is excluded. We anticipate that the staff and public groups that will be working with the designers will speak to these issues. We've also been trying to work with the Municipal Center and the mayor's office to design a downtown hygiene center that is closer to where people gather, but we don't necessarily want it to be located in the library.

**Dubrow:** The Design Commission could help with this point. We asked the architect for City Hall for his thoughts on the issue of the homeless and he wasn't sure how to respond. The key players in the city need to get together and discuss the relevant issues of how to find a balance between public space and amenities. People are uncomfortable talking about it and therefore, a joint discussion could take the burden off of the individual. I encourage the Commission to take the lead and have this dialog with the appropriate parties.

**Moon:** At the initial presentation, the public loved Rem Koolhaas's poking fun at Seattle and I encourage you to maintain a similar sense of humor and playfulness.

**Action:** **The Design Commission appreciates the presentation and makes the following comments and recommendations.**

- **The Commission appreciates hearing a statement of the general principles that will inform future meetings;**
- **would like the design team to focus on the deeper issues of context; and**
- **encourages the project team to call upon the Design Center and Commission for help with facilitating dialogues with other city agencies.**

---

102899.1      Project: **Central Library**

Attendees: Andrea Addison, Seattle Public Library  
Jamie Aisford, Gilbane  
MaryBeth Binns, Design Construction and Land Use  
Jerry Chihara  
David Della  
Roland Falb  
Tony Gale, Executive Services Department  
Barbara Goldstein, Seattle Arts Commission  
Barb Gregory  
Jess Harris, Design Construction and Land Use  
Rich Jensen  
Steve Kay  
Kristian Kofoed, Design Construction and Land Use  
Cliff Marks, Design Construction and Land Use  
Jeff Miller  
Cher Ravagni  
Linda Saunto  
Robert Scully, Design Center  
Denni Shefrin, Design Construction and Land Use  
Karen Sherwood, Design Center  
Matthew Stadler  
David Sucher  
Jon Taylor, Callison Architecture  
Steve Trainer, Seneca Group  
Gordon Walker, Gordon Walker Architecture and Planning

---

102899.2      Project: **John C. Cannon Retirement Facility**  
                  Phase: Schematic  
          Presenters: Arun Bhalaik, Global Health Management  
                      Lynn French, Global Health Management  
                      Emil J Kucirek, Design Alliance  
                      Jim Mohundro, Office of Housing  
                      Gordon New, Global Health Management  
                      Jerry Suder, Design Construction and Land Use  
          Attendees: James Hurd  
          Time: 1.0 hr. (SDC Ref. # DC00130)

Development of the John C. Cannon Retirement Facility, located at 23<sup>rd</sup> Avenue and Yesler in Seattle's Central District neighborhood, began in 1995. Because there were little or no care facilities specifically for African American elders at the time, Mayor Norman Rice formed a task force comprised of private citizens and members of the health care community to investigate the situation. The African American Community Health Network was also engaged by the mayor to define the relevant issues. They recommended improved access to senior services, outreach & health programs, information and referral services, and the development of an assisted living facility in the proposed area. When a new mayor and administration took office in 1998, the project team was asked to compete for ownership of the city owned property. The team looked to the community for support and the interested parties developed a plan that called for an assisted living facility in the Central Area; the plan was approved by the Seattle City Council in November 1998. Additionally, the neighborhood planning process put forth two recommendations for the area that recommended the adoption of the Seattle Building Code ordinance for assisted living, and the rezoning of the proposed site from an L-3 to an L-4. Both recommendations were approved by the City Council. Further, the project team garnered unconditional support for the proposed project from local organizations and neighbors.

The site is located across the street from a Catholic Community Services building, a neighborhood branch library, Starbucks, Walgreens, a market, and bus transportation on 23<sup>rd</sup> Avenue and Yesler and Jackson Streets. As such, this is an optimal site for senior living. The required functions of an assisted living facility are currently under review by the State Department of Health and are similar to nursing home care. The average occupant is 83 years old and typically has three bodily impairments. The advantage of assisted living over nursing home care is that the resident feels like they are in their own home. An assisted living facility provides a head registered nurse and staff of certified assistants, who provide general care and friendship to the residents.

The site is approximately 200 x 250 feet, is at grade on 23<sup>rd</sup> Avenue and slopes down toward 22<sup>nd</sup> Avenue. L-4 zoning guidelines restrict the building width to 90 feet. The team is proposing a design departure from this restriction by joining two 90 foot buildings with a transparent, glazed, elevated walkway. A dining room, recreation area and beauty salon are located on the first level of the main building and residential units are on floors one through four. A courtyard will be located adjacent to all of the resident services and elevators. Because of the L-4 zoning requirements, the initial design review questioned the location of a parking and drop-off zone in front of the building due to the amount of pavement that would be required. The design team redesigned the scheme with a grass lawn, primarily underground parking, and an additional large vehicle drop-off in the back of the building. Adjacent to the main entrance of the facility will be a wellness center that will be run by an independent organization, a marketing office and solarium. The project team is hoping the project will be rezoned to allow the public to take advantage of the wellness facility. There will be a total of twenty, one bedroom apartments and 97 studios and a laundry facility will be provided on each floor of the building. The 23<sup>rd</sup>



Avenue facade will include a brick base, projecting windows at the one-bedroom units, and a highly glazed entrance area.

The proposed project is currently under review by the State Department of Health and under design review with the Design Review Board (DRB). Although the DRB is supportive of the program, they have several concerns. They include, how the proposed project would fit in with the neighborhood, the lack of visual access on 22<sup>nd</sup> Avenue, and the requested design departure to link two 90 foot module buildings, thereby ending up with a structure that is twice the anticipated size based on the L-4 code. The DRB's major concern is with the proposed relationship between the entry façade of the building and the street. The L-4 code does not allow parking in this area and the proposed building setback would limit visual and physical access.

### **Discussion:**

- Layzer:** I am concerned that the placement of the parking strip has created a challenge for pedestrians with limited mobility going to and from the bus stops on 23<sup>rd</sup> Avenue and Yesler and Jackson Streets.
- French:** We are planning a meeting with Metro to discuss the possibility of repositioning the bus stops so they drop passengers off closer to the facility.
- Foley:** Are the parking spaces in front of the building going to be eliminated and replaced with a continuous sidewalk with street trees as part of the frontage improvements?
- Kucirek:** I met with Richard Lindsey of the Seattle Police Department to discuss the department's safety concerns that landscaping elements may obstruct visual access into the building, and the deep setback of the entry vestibule. As a result, the current design solution is to place a flat grassy area in front of the building.
- Jaso:** I concur with the DRB's concerns regarding the relationship between the front of the building and the street. I also don't see the proposed 'linking element' between the buildings as an appropriately scaled elevated walkway. It seems as though it would be largely out of proportion with the buildings and the neighborhood. I don't support it as a design departure at this time. It would be helpful to see street elevations that show the scale of the buildings in the surrounding context. I am also concerned about the inclusion of the commercial component in the project.
- French:** We still need to discuss the commercial element with the City Council because the current zoning does not provide for it.
- Jaso:** I would also like to hear more about how the facility will provide a supportive expression of culture. Further, if residents will be calling this place *home*, I question the placement of the clinic and administrative offices at the entrance. I think it would detract from the residential experience which should be the priority. It is critical that the landscape design be seriously considered in front of the building and in the courtyard. Perhaps you should consider including a garden that offers healing and therapeutic benefits.
- Foley:** Since the pick-up and drop-off area won't be in front of the building, its final placement should also be thoughtfully considered and resolved.
- Moon:** I challenge you to re-examine the cultural component and try to create a stronger social interaction and integration with the local community.
- Dubrow:** If your resident patient population is reaching an age where issues of mobility and orientation are paramount, I would like to see more attention paid to how the design of the facility—with wayfinding devices for example—will make life easier for them.
- Action:** **The Commission appreciates the presentation and makes the following comments and recommendations.**

- **The Commission urges the design team to strengthen the connection between the building and the street and to minimize the building's mass;**
- **encourages the team to look to the surrounding context for design cues;**
- **has serious concerns that the placement of the clinic at the residential entry may detract from the residential character;**
- **urges the team to integrate elements of cultural expression into the building;**
- **urges careful treatment of the landscape components and selection of materials;**  
**and**
- **looks forward to seeing the project again when these issues have been addressed and ultimately resolved.**

102899.3 COMMISSION BUSINESS

- ACTION ITEMS      A. MINUTES OF THE 07 OCTOBER MEETING – APPROVED AS AMENDED  
                            B. TIMESHEETS
- ANNOUNCEMENTS C. AFFORDABLE LIVE/WORK HOUSING FOR ARTISTS, 29 OCTOBER, 12:00-6:00  
                            D. EXHIBITION CENTER OPENING CEREMONY, 30 OCTOBER AT 10 A.M.  
                            E. UNION STATION OPEN HOUSES, 08 – 10 NOVEMBER  
                            F. MERRILL GARDENS DESIGN REVIEW MEETING, 09 NOVEMBER, 7:00 P.M.  
                            G. HOLLY PARK DESIGN REVIEW MEETING, 09 NOVEMBER, 8:00 P.M.
- DISCUSSION ITEMS H. FOND FAREWELL / RAHAIM  
                            I. CHICAGO DESIGN COMMISSION TASK FORCE / WALLS  
                            J. GREEN STREETS / BICKNELL  
                            K. HIAWATHA PIPELINE CORRIDOR / BICKNELL  
                            L. LRRP / SIZOV  
                            M. DESIGN CENTER OPEN HOUSE, 16 NOVEMBER, 5:00 – 7:00 PM / RAHAIM  
                            N. MILLENNIUM LIGHTING PROJECT / CUBELL  
                            O. OFFICE OF HOUSING MEETING / RAHAIM

---

102899.4      Project: **Roxhill Park**  
                  Phase: Schematic  
                  Presenter: Charles Anderson, Anderson Ray Landscape Architecture  
                  Don Bullard, Department of Parks and Recreation  
                  Amy Carlson, King County Department of Natural Resources  
                  Karen Goto, King County Department of Natural Resources  
                  Shannon Nichol, Anderson Ray Landscape Architecture  
                  Time: .75 hr. (SDC Ref. # DC00085)

Roxhill Park, located between Southwest Barton and Cambridge Streets near 26<sup>th</sup> and 29<sup>th</sup> Avenues southwest, is a wetlands reestablishment project in the beginning stages of design development. The park used to be the origination point of Longfellow Creek “[but] the headwaters have been channeled into a combination sewer and storm-water pipe that runs along the eastern edge of the park.” When the Parks Department acquired the property in the 1960s, it had previously been filled in an effort to strengthen its real estate value. A shopping center is located to the north of the site, a retirement village to the east, low income housing to the south and single family housing to the west. In the late 1980s the local community expressed an interest in restoring the natural wetlands on the site. “The citizens applied for a grant from the Seattle Neighborhood Matching Fund but were turned down.” Because Seattle Public Utilities (SPU) is involved in a number of projects on Longfellow Creek, they have expressed interest in the Roxhill Park project. SPU has earmarked funds to hire the King County Department of Natural Resources as the lead designers. The Parks Department supplemented this effort by hiring the landscape architecture firm and wetland specialists, Anderson & Ray, to act as technical experts in the restoration of the natural wetlands on the site. Although a detailed cost estimate has yet to be done, the budget for the project is estimated at \$800,000, of which, \$320,000 has been secured. The team will reassess the available funds in February 2000 and decide whether to begin construction the following June or, budget not permitting, wait until 2001.

The project team began their site analysis by excavating ten soil pits and found seven feet of peat on top of the natural clay layer in each. The seven feet allows for design flexibility without harming the wetland below. Ground water monitoring wells were installed in five of the ten pits to examine the water quality. Between June 1999 and the present, the readings have indicated a fluctuation of one to two feet in the ground water level, and that the water flows from south to north; which is consistent with the flow of Longfellow Creek. Before the area was developed, water infiltrated the entire site. In time, the basin was developed and a series of pipes were installed that redirect the flow from 27<sup>th</sup> Avenue Southwest to the upper basin. In an effort to improve the water quality and to accent the existing park, the team is looking for opportunities to expose the flow in a stream or other open system. Although the area is not currently a habitat for salmon, the hope is to accommodate resident trout. Of paramount concern to the project team, is how to reintroduce and design the wetland so it maintains integrity over time and will be beneficial to wildlife. Further site analysis has revealed the impacts of circulation on the site, with pedestrian flow coming primarily from the neighboring school. There is also an existing tot lot at the front of the site that will impact the design. The seniors who live on the eastside of the site use the park as a circulation path to the shopping area and transportation hubs. The team is hoping that the design will encourage interaction between the children from the neighboring school and the seniors.

The goals of the project include a desire to exploit the large size, 13.5 acres, of the boggy site. In addition to optimizing the ecological benefits of the area, the team would like to integrate a visual landmark component and identity marker into the design, while maintaining the integrity of the suburban context. Three types of matter from the site will be explored in three schematic designs. The high and dry elements of the site will be used to develop a scheme for a manicured park. The wet and dark matter

for a challenging, wild and rich in park-scape. And, the edge between the two is the third area of investigation. In an effort to shape these elements, the team developed a series of potential schemes. The first keeps the circulation along the edge with the wetland as an under layer that could be seen through floating blocks. The second maintains the circulation on the surrounding blocks. The third scheme is for a traditional organic park-scape. The final scheme proposes an entirely naturalistic response.

### **Discussion:**

- Cipriani:** It's possible that you could develop one of the most innovative reclamation projects in the country if you were to work with some of the neighboring private property owners to help sponsor the effort.
- Dubrow:** You mean, extend the project boundaries?
- Bullard:** We're struggling to find the funding as it is. We're hoping that eventually there will be enough pressure on the shopping center owners to do their part.
- Cipriani:** I'm not suggesting that you expand the scope of the project, but rather to provide a conceptual vision of the larger whole.
- Bullard:** Another related project that is going on is the Longfellow Creek Legacy Trail.
- Jaso:** It may be possible to get funding from the private property owners by offering them sponsorship advertising.
- Moon:** Your site analysis is great. It would be good to see more programmatic analysis. I'm intrigued by the idea of an organic ground plane.
- Cipriani:** I also recommend that you look at the La Brea Tar Pits in Los Angeles. It's a similar concept of a natural condition within a very urban and public space.
- Dubrow:** Also, other current park projects are exploring these issues. Perhaps a roundtable discussion with some of these other players would be useful in developing a direction and attitude.
- Girvin:** I am excited by your analysis and notion of drawing people in while respecting the integrity of the wetland. Based on your development on Atlantic Street, I am confident that you will move in the right direction.
- Moon:** Actually, I was proposing a lot of well-planned intrusions into the wetlands because otherwise, how can people interact and learn from the environment.
- Foley:** When you're analyzing how to treat the pollutants, I would encourage you to look at natural methods such as bio-filtration. They may be less expensive and could provide educational opportunities.
- Bullard:** We are concerned that silt may gum up the peat over time and will have to devise a solution to this problem in the event that it occurs.
- Action:** **The Commission appreciates the thorough presentation and makes the following comments and recommendations.**
- **The Commission enthusiastically supports the direction of the project;**
  - **is encouraged by the level of analysis and the project team's restraint in terms of human intrusion;**
  - **urges the team to continue clarifying the entrances and strategy for how to design the areas that will be occupied by humans and those that will not;**
  - **would like to hear the team's attitude toward potentially including an interpretive component; and**
  - **looks forward to seeing the project again during design development.**

---

102899.5      Project: **Lincoln Reservoir**  
                  Phase: Schematic (Subcommittee)  
                  Presenter: John Curtin, Seattle Public Utilities  
                  Jeff Girvin, The Berger Partnership  
                  Beth Purcell, Department of Parks and Recreation  
                  Lowell W Warren, Tetra Tech / KCM, Inc.  
                  Attendees: Jerry Arbes, Friends of Seattle's Olmsted Parks  
                  Sylvia Cavazos, Seattle Public Utilities  
                  Jonathan Morley, The Berger Partnership  
                  Kay Rood, Groundswell Off Broadway  
                  Time: 1.0 hr. (SDC Ref. #DC00032)

*In response to a State of Washington regulatory requirement to cover all open reservoirs in the next 20 to 25 years, Seattle Public Utilities (SPU) embarked upon the process of retaining a design and engineering team to study the existing Lincoln Reservoir. After review, SPU made the decision to construct a new, 15 million-gallon subsurface reservoir in the footprint of the existing open reservoir, with a park above. Lincoln Reservoir is located within an urban village at Nagle Place and East Howell Street in Seattle's Capitol Hill neighborhood. The surrounding park is used heavily by both residents and students. The 21 million gallon reservoir was constructed in 1901 after the Great Seattle Fire of June 1889, is supplied by the Cedar River Pipeline, and serves the 316 foot elevation pressure zone south to Yesler Avenue. Construction should be completed by mid-2002.*

*There are two major elements to the Lincoln Reservoir Covering project:*

- 1) the replacement of the existing above ground open water reservoir with an underground, concrete reservoir and all the disinfection, piping and valving that is associated with its replacement, and Phase I of the Park Master Plan (grand lawn, trees, pathways, lighting, on top of the buried reservoir; and*
- 2) the development of a conceptual Park Site Master Plan which incorporates public art into the design of the park.*

Lincoln Reservoir is part of the first phase of the Reservoir Covering Project. The replacement of the reservoir will be funded by the Capitol Hill Neighborhood Fund. KCM, Inc and The Berger Partnership were hired to design the new park. The project team has also hired a certified arborist and urban planner. Barbara Goldstein and the Seattle Arts Commission hired the project artist, Douglas Hollis. SPU is funding the development of the park site and concept master plan for the new open space. The project is in the schematic design phase and is a priority in three different neighborhood plans. The team is working on the design of the open space that will be acquired by removing the reservoir. The project team has been working with the community groups, Groundswell Off Broadway and Friends of Seattle Olmsted Parks. The Parks Department has also been working closely with SPU and the community and design teams.

The park site master planning process began one and a half years ago with extensive community involvement. A by-pass system is needed to continue to supply water when the reservoir is closed during construction. The expanded scope of the site restoration will include elements of the Park Master Plan. The project has a certificate of approval from the Landmarks Board that will allow the team to move forward with contract one. A second certificate of approval to place a parapet wall around the existing reservoir has also been secured. The cost of the project is 10.6 million with the estimated cost of the first

contract at 1.5 million.

SPU will require site access to maintain the underground reservoir and will look at the durability of the project over the next 100 years. The Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) has similar concerns. The urban context and historic legacy of the park are important issues, with the historic Olmsted legacy being particularly significant. The historic 1907 gate house was constructed before the reservoir. This is the densest residential community in Seattle and has the highest level of pedestrian activity on a day to day basis. The park is in the central part of the city and could have a regional appeal. Sound Transit has also become involved with the implementation of a new station on Howe Street and Broadway, one block from the park, and the team anticipates new users because of this. Seattle Central Community College is also adjacent to the site.

Other key elements of the design will include a large scale water feature, unprogrammed space for performances, a restroom, lighting components and a park maintenance facility. There is an existing jogging track around the reservoir that community would also like to maintain. Art is also an important requirement of the community and the Park Site Master Plan. Using these components, the design team has developed a layer of ideas. All of the circulation within the park will tie in with the historic context and community. The water feature will be funded in part by the Seattle Arts Commission, and the team worked closely with the artist on the design. The gate house will be restored and lit from within, thereby acting as a lantern in the landscape. Another issue was to preserve the alignment of the original parapet wall. Details of phase one of the project include developing the entry points at each corner with granite bollards and globe feature lighting reminiscent of the 1900s. Lighting throughout the park will also include contemporary fixtures. Phase two will reflect similar details.

Elements of the project that are not currently funded include, some lighting, a large part of the water feature cone, a significant amount of tree planting, the children's play area and the shelter house. DPR is in the process of identifying further funds for the project.

### **Discussion:**

- Dubrow:** There is a general philosophy of trying to distinguish between the old and the new elements while still fitting a historic character. You seem to be trying to fit more than distinguish. Can you tell us why you've chosen this approach as opposed to one that distinguishes while still respecting the character.
- Girvin:** This project is adaptive reuse not historic preservation. To do historic restoration here would be one sided because of the value of the space in the surrounding context. We are doing some historic restoration such as the exterior of the gate house. In places we are kind of simulating but we have functional requirements to meet as well.
- Dubrow:** But do you design all the elements so they look old, or do you have layers ? The historic parapet walls you are replicating could be expressed as a new layer of interpretation. Maybe your efforts to reinforce the historic character are too extreme.
- Girvin:** We will address this issue in design development and it will be a challenge.
- Miller:** This is a remarkable park. I'm thrilled that you're keeping a portion of the wall. The task is how to interpret the next 100 years of a civilization in a clearly articulated way. Include some modern elements that challenge the public to cross the line because you don't know what's going to happen in 100 years.
- Moon:** In use too. Olmsted's ideas were designed for his day and I encourage you to think about what is relevant in our day.
- Dubrow:** It would be helpful to see a conceptual plan of the sacred elements and where you have room to play.

- Arbes:** I do see this park as an area of restoration and I don't think the Olmsted plan is out of date. Some of the poor planning that was implemented in the fifties has been a graffiti magnet and I think that components that reflect a historic character also support preservation.
- Dubrow:** I think we're both supportive of the preservation dimensions. The opposition I see is to respect the historic character as opposed to something that is engineered. Maybe there is a third option. A place where there is room for contemporary design that also respects the historic character.
- Foley:** When will SPU's project be completed?
- Curtin:** Construction will commence at the beginning of 2001 and will be completed by the summer of 2002.
- Dubrow:** Will the attention to preservation and creation to open space be applied to other Reservoir Covering projects?
- Curtin:** The water quality decision to place the new Lincoln Reservoir underground offered the opportunity to create new open space."
- Cipriani:** If the Commission gets the opportunity to review specific plans for the future Sound Transit station, maybe we can reference some of the historic aspects of the Olmsted legacy.
- Action:** **The Commission appreciates the presentation and makes the following comments and recommendations.**
- **The Commission enthusiastically supports the planning and design efforts and the collaboration between SPU and the Neighborhood to develop a common vision for the park;**
  - **encourages the team to continue to explore the meaning and interpretation of the historic preservation issues;**
  - **urges the Parks Department to consider this a priority project within the program; and**
  - **appreciates the involvement of the Seattle Arts Commission and would like to hear from the project artist, Douglas Hollis, at the next meeting.**



---

102899.6      Project: **Royal Brougham Pedestrian Bridge**  
                  Phase: Conceptual (Subcommittee)  
          Presenters: Joe Beck, King County Department of Transportation  
                          Rich Murakami, Arai / Jackson Architects and Planners  
                          Steve Pearce, Strategic Planning Office  
                          Carol Pennie, KPFF Consulting Engineers  
          Attendees: Brian Glas, Washington State Department of Transportation  
                          Sheldon Teel, King County Metro  
          Time: 1.0 hr. (SDC Ref. # DC00130)

The Royal Brougham Pedestrian Bridge project is a little less than 50% designed. The goal is to provide safe pedestrian and bicycle crossing from the stadium area across the Burlington Northern railroad tracks, and a grade separation between pedestrians and vehicles, particularly during events. When the SR 519 project began, the team identified the need to provide pedestrian circulation across the tracks. The Weller Street Bridge and the Royal Brougham Bridge were proposed as solutions. The estimated cost for the project is 7.5 million with the local sports teams contributing a total of one million. This is not a sky bridge, but will connect a number of public streets and will be open 24 hours. The team is hoping to incorporate the Mountains To Sound Green Way bike and pedestrian trail into the project.

The same design team that designed the Weller Street bridge has been hired for the Royal Brougham project. The same artists, Valerie Otani and Fernando D'Agostino, who were selected by the King County Arts Council, have also been selected. The team emphasized that the reason they proposed to grade separate the pedestrian walkway over the intersection of Royal Brougham and Fourth Avenue, is because when the State's 519 project is completed, Royal Brougham as a surface street will be closed at the railroad tracks. It will not be possible to walk or drive from the stadiums over to the east side of the tracks. Our goal has been to provide high quality special event transit service on the busway. Also, the intersection is the terminus for two ramps that connect to the 519 project. Construction is slated for fall or Winter 2000. Half of the identified funds are from a Federal Transit Administration grant that was provided for transportation projects related to stadiums. There is also one million from King County, a half million grant from the Mountains to Sound program, and 1.5 million from Sound Transit.

The walkway is located 230 feet south of Royal Brougham Way. The team worked with Metro to locate the walkway as far north as possible in order to avoid impacting their base. The walkway will consist of four spans of pre-cast concrete girders whose material was selected for its economy and low maintenance. The walkway will have a concrete deck, handrails and throw barriers. The Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) will set the spans. KPFF Consulting Engineers will construct the main walkway and stairways, and once the final span is set, Sound Transit will implement the handrails, throw barriers and ramp. During construction, pedestrians will be able to use an existing ADA accessible route along Royal Brougham Way.

This project is the second part of the Weller Street project, although on a more urban and industrial scale. The project team has described the area around the project as, "freeway vernacular." Their design approach was to blend in with this context in their creation of a pedestrian friendly bridge through the area. Beginning with the notion of "freeway vernacular," the team intends to concentrate on design elements that will establish a pedestrian friendly rhythm. They are required to incorporate eight-foot throw barriers and lighting for the 24 hour bridge. The view of the walkway from street level will be obscured by the freeway ramps. The project has two artists who will incorporate the themes of sporting events and the Mountains to Sound project. The team is also in the process of deciding whether to spend more of the budget on the ends of the bridge, or to more fully develop the circulation route itself.

**Discussion:**

- Cipriani:** I commend you on your Weller Street design in terms of its overall pedestrian user friendliness. As a general comment, your current project is located in an area that has more unfriendly pedestrian infrastructure per acre than anywhere in the United States. I think WSDOT may be getting too involved in the design of the SR 519 ramps.
- Miller:** Do you have to include the throw barriers in the design?
- Beck:** Some people who work in the area have expressed concern about the type of activity that happens after games.
- Dubrow:** Does the design of the throw barriers have to be as prominent across the length of the bridge?
- Pennie:** It's only an issue of concern on certain areas of the bridge.
- Dubrow:** This is an opportunity for the artist to design a solution that represents the rhythm and underplays the throw barriers where they are not needed. Since the conditions are different along the walkway, your treatment should also reflect the variety of experiences.
- Foley:** I would encourage you to consider spending more of your budget on the ends of the walkway, particularly on the west. Perhaps there's a way to signify something a little more special at these points.
- Murakami:** The artist can create some elements at the vertical conveyance points.
- Dubrow:** Because the design of your Weller Street project has built up our expectations, it's hard for us to accept this proposal the way it is. The "freeway vernacular" approach is not appropriate for pedestrians. You should rethink what qualities contribute to a positive pedestrian experience and incorporate them into the design.
- Rahaim:** Assuming that we are going to live with highway environments, if you're trying to encourage pedestrians to use the walkway, it should be quite distinct, perhaps with color, vitality and humor.
- Dubrow:** If you can't articulate the length of the bridge, at least consider doing something at the ends.
- Moon:** Consider incorporating views along the way that can be places to pause. I'm not convinced that "freeway vernacular" is necessary. Find a way to celebrate the dense infrastructure in the area within the restrictions of the budget.
- Girvin:** I encourage you to look for more appropriate wire fabric. There are many alternatives to chain link fencing.
- Action:** **The Commission appreciates the presentation and makes the following comments and recommendations.**
- **The Commission appreciates the team's tremendous efforts to coordinate the project with the surrounding neighbors;**
  - **encourages the team to look for a richer solution to the pedestrian bridge by taking advantage of the variety of opportunities and conditions along its length; and**
  - **urges the team to consider a design solution that diverges from the surrounding freeway aesthetic.**